

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

RICHARD JOHNSTON,

Case No. 3:22-cv-00080-MMD-CSD

14

Plaintiff,

ORDER

DR. MARTIN NAUGHTON,

Defendant.

11 Pro se Plaintiff Richard Johnston brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before
12 the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R” or “Recommendation”) of United
13 States Magistrate Judge Craig S. Denney (ECF No. 26), recommending the Court deny
14 Johnston’s motion for a preliminary injunction (ECF No. 5 (“Motion”)). Plaintiff had until
15 July 22, 2022, to file an objection. To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed.¹ For
16 this reason, and as explained below, the Court adopts the R&R, and will deny the Motion.

17 The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
18 recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party
19 fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the Court is not required to
20 conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas*
21 *v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); see also *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114,
22 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and
23 recommendations is required if, but *only if*, one or both parties file objections to the

25 ¹Johnston requested a 90-day day extension of time to file an objection to the R&R.
26 (ECF No. 29.) The Court granted that request in part, and denied it in part, giving Johnston
27 until July 22, 2022, to file an objection. (ECF No. 30.) Johnston then filed another motion
28 for an extension of time to file an objection. (ECF No. 32.) The Court denied that motion
and warned Johnston that it would adopt the R&R and deny the Motion if he did not file
an objection to the R&R by July 22, 2022. (ECF No. 33.) But Johnston did not timely file
an objection to the R&R.

1 findings and recommendations.") (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory
2 Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court "need only satisfy itself that there is no
3 clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.").

4 Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct de novo review, and is
5 satisfied Judge Denney did not clearly err. Here, Judge Denney recommends denying the
6 motion because he cannot determine from the evidence Johnston submitted whether he
7 is likely to prevail on the merits, and it does not appear Johnston would be irreparably
8 harmed if an injunction did not issue. (ECF No. 26 at 7-9.) The Court agrees with Judge
9 Denney. Having reviewed the R&R and the record in this case, the Court will adopt the
10 R&R in full.

11 It is therefore ordered that Judge Denney's Report and Recommendation (ECF
12 No. 26) is accepted and adopted in full.

13 It is further ordered that Johnston's motion for a preliminary injunction (ECF No. 5)
14 is denied.

15 DATED THIS 25th Day of July 2022.



16
17
18 MIRANDA M. DU
19 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28